The Times-Dispatch

DAILY—WEEKLY—SUNDAY.

Business Office.....916 E. Main Street
South Richmond.....1103 Hull Street
Petersburg Bureau.....109 N. Sycamore Street
Lynchburg Bureau.....215 Eighth Street

BY MAIL. POSTAGE PAID.	One Year.	Six Mos.	Three Mos.	One Mo
Daily with Sunday	$6.00	$3.00	$1.50	.55
Daily without Sunday	4.00	2.00	1.00	.35
Sunday edition only	2.00	1.00	.50	.25
Weekly (Wednesday)	1.00	.50	.25	...

By Times-Dispatch Carrier Delivery Service in Richmond (and suburbs) and Petersburg—

	One Week.
Daily with Sunday	14 cents
Daily without Sunday	10 cents
Sunday only	5 cents

Entered January 27, 1903, at Richmond, Va., as second-class matter under act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 5, 1910.

PRISONERS OF WAR.

McClure's Magazine is printing "Goldwin Smith's Reminiscences." In its September number it prints what Mr. Smith wrote about the treatment of prisoners of war in Northern and Southern prisons. A correspondent, "W. C. B.," of Richmond, writes that "it ought not to go unanswered." We think so, too; but the same misstatements of facts have been made so often and answered so often that it is almost hopeless to expect that they will ever be corrected by the magazines which give currency to them. We do not believe for a moment that McClure's Magazine will print the facts about it; but, just the same, we shall tell them. Mr. Smith's statement to which our correspondent calls attention is as follows:

"Prisoners of war were well treated. I visited the prison-camp at Chicago and saw that its inmates were well fed and were suffering no hardship beyond that of confinement. If they died under imprisonment, it was as the caged eagle dies. I visited the prisoners' hospital at Baltimore, went through every part of it, and satisfied myself that the treatment was good. My visit was unannounced. On Thanksgiving Day the table was spread with the good things of the season. I record this as an answer to the charges of cruelty rife at the time in England. It was the more notable as the treatment of Federal prisoners in some of the Confederate prisons was known to be most inhuman. In the Andersonville prison camp it was devilish, and such as no want of resources on the part of the captors could excuse. I saw at Annapolis the first batch of prisoners exchanged from Andersonville; they were living skeletons. I put my finger and thumb round the upperpart of a large man's arm. It must be said that Grant was partly responsible, if, as was understood, he refused to exchange prisoners. No laws of war surely can warrant the retention of prisoners whom a captor cannot feed. They ought to be released on paroie."

What are the facts? According to the report of Edwin M. Stanton, United States Secretary of War, 22,576 Federal prisoners died in Confederate hands during the war; 26,436 Confederate prisoners died in Federal hands. In round numbers, according to the official report of Surgeon-General Barnes, of the United States Army, the number of Confederate prisoners in Federal hands was 220,000, and the number of Federal prisoners in Confederate hands 270,000. Out of the 270,000 Federal prisoners in Confederate hands 22,000 died, while of the 220,000 Confederate prisoners in Federal hands over 26,000 died. More than 12 per cent. of the Confederates in Federal hands died; less than 9 per cent. of the Federals in Confederate hands died. In his reply to James G. Blaine in the House of Representatives at Washington, January 11, 1876, Benjamin H. Hill, of Georgia, said: "It appears from the official record that the Confederates came from Elmira, from Fort Delaware, and from Rock Island and other places with their fingers frozen off, with their toes frozen off, and with teeth dropped out."

Every effort made by the Confederate authorities to obtain an exchange of prisoners was refused by the Federal authorities, and partly upon the recommendation of General Grant himself, who preferred that the Federal prisoners at Andersonville and in other Confederate prisons should die rather than that the Confederate prisoners should be released, lest they return to the service, and so strengthen the resistance to him and his army. All appeals from the Confederate authorities were rejected; all the petitions of the Federal prisoners themselves at Andersonville were denied. In September, 1864, the Federal prisoners at Andersonville adopted resolutions setting forth their unhappy estate, one of which read as follows:

"Resolved, That while allowing the Confederate authorities all due praise for the attention paid to our prisoners, numbers of our men are daily consigned to early graves in the prime of manhood, far from home and kindred, and this is not caused intentionally by the Confederate Government, but by the force of circumstances."

In August, 1865, Junius Henri Brown, a Northern writer, perfectly familiar with the conditions at Andersonville and in other Southern prisons, said that if the exchange of prisoners asked by the Confederate Government had been assented to, "at least twelve or fifteen thousand heroic lives would have been saved to the Republic."

Down in a country grave-yard in Georgia there rests at least one former prisoner of war who passed through the hospital at Baltimore, and endured the long agony at Point Lookout, and suffered the tortures of Elmira, who would speak, if his voice were not stilled forever, of the barbarities of prison life in the great Christian North; of comrades who were permitted by their keepers to die like brutes, of frozen feet, of starved bodies, of unshriven souls, and of his own terrible experiences which made this once stalwart youth a prematurely old man and finally ended in his death. A thousand witnesses could even yet be called to establish the infamy of the treatment accorded by the Federal authorities to the helpless soldiers who fell into their hands, and many men who wore the Blue, if they could speak the truth, would testify that they were as well taken care of in the Southern prisons as were the soldiers of the Confederacy in the field. But what is the use? The history of these things is written by "the other side."

ALEXANDER LOCKHART NELSON.

Fifty-two years of service to the young men of Virginia and of many other States was the proud record of Professor Alexander Lockhart Nelson, of Washington and Lee University, who died last Wednesday evening. He was the last but one of the members of the faculty of that University under the presidency of General Robert E. Lee, the only surviving member now being Dr. Edward S. Joynes, of the University of South Carolina.

The account of the life of Professor Nelson sent out from Lexington, where he died, says "thousands of young men have gone forth from his classroom to adorn every walk and profession in life. Some are Governors of States, some are judges, some doctors of divinity, and some have attained high influence in the councils of the nation." This is strikingly true. In 1854 Professor Nelson was appointed to the chair of mathematics in Washington College, and it was not until 1906 that he retired from active duties. At that time the board of trustees of the University made him emeritus professor of mathematics. The semi-centennial of his professorship was celebrated in 1904 by the alumni of the college and a massive silver service was presented to him on that occasion. He served under five presidencies of the University.

A life-long member of the Presbyterian Church at Lexington, he was a deacon at the time when Stonewall Jackson filled a similar position. For almost fifty years he was a member of the choir. He was conspicuous for his faithful and long service to his Church.

For more than half a century he exerted an influence over young men that reached out to nearly every part of the nation, and no one can measure the worth of his service to the cause of education. His long record of service can scarcely be equaled in the history of the colleges of America. Virginia has just cause to lament the passing of so eminent a son.

LABOR DAY.

This is Labor Day. It will be celebrated all over the country. In nearly all the States it is a legal holiday. It is a legal holiday in Virginia. In St. Paul it will be distinguished by a speech by the President of the United States, and in Fargo, North Dakota, by a few remarks from the former President. The day was first observed by the Knights of Labor in 1884, and since 1887 it has been celebrated generally, by parades and speeches and conferences and excursions and banquets, and by an almost total suspension of work in all the trades. In Richmond it will be kept to-day, and we wish our fellow-workingmen a very pleasant time without accident or mischance of any sort to mar their enjoyment.

THE SHAME OF THE COLLEGES.

There was a pathetic story in one of the magazines not long ago about a college professor and the learned history he was writing, but could not finish, because his salary was so small that he could not, with the cost of living so high, hire a nurse for his little child. On his slim salary, it was all he could do to make ends meet. He had no time to devote to scholarly research; between the demands of his class-room and his home, there was no opportunity for anything else.

This is the true story of many college professors, all over this country. They are patient men, loath to complain, and that is why so little protest is heard from them. As a rule, they are underpaid. Most of them are in the profession with the purpose of doing real service. Few of them are in it for money, for those who know are aware that there is no money in the profession of teaching.

If the professor has others dependent upon him, he has a hard time pulling through without going into debt. He cannot afford to have a large family; and when, in later years, the expense of educating his children falls upon him, heavy is the burden of the college teacher. In some of our colleges young professors and instructors, even though unmarried, find that they can save little from their yearly stipend.

Such a condition of affairs is driving the best men in our colleges out of a profession which they would doubtless adorn. The result is that mediocre men, time-servers, are entering the profession of collegiate teaching and are giving second-class instruction at second-class rates to the young men and women in the colleges. The costly result is that the student does not get the sort of education that he is paying for.

Scholarship, too, suffers by reason of the inadequate compensation received by professors. In these days of scientific investigation, few are the college professors who are not animated by a desire to add something to the world's knowledge of various branches of science and learning. In some cases, they manage to do it; in too many cases they are cramped by circumstances and can do nothing. They have little time; their families must be looked after; and there is no money left for travel or for a stenographer. Many valuable books could be written to-day if our college professors had enough money to employ some one to do the manual part of writing the books.

Hidden away in small colleges are men of burning zeal for scholarship, men who wish to contribute the work of their minds to the benefit of mankind—and yet they cannot. They are tied to their posts by bonds of academic red tape, by lack of funds, by adverse conditions that seem never to decrease. Patient, ever hoping, they are faithful to their daily tasks.

Too often it is the case that the college professor is worn out with the grind of years of teaching. His interest in his work flags, and, correspondingly, the interest of his students dies away. The once brilliant teacher dwindles into a drone, and the student and the world are losers by the transformation.

College professors deserve to be paid enough to enable them to live comfortably and to surround themselves with facilities which will permit them to do the work they wish to do. None but the best men should be allowed to teach the youth of the land, and they should receive at least a reasonable compensation.

THAT MAN CATILINA.

Last week, the Hon. John Bigelow wrote as follows to the New York Evening Post thanking it for its remarkable article about the Colonel:

"In the absence of a Cicero in or out of Congress to protect us, it is fit that the public press should no longer, 'with bated breath and whispering humbleness,' tolerate the stealthy progress toward a dictatorship of an aspiring Catilina Redivivus, who taxes our patience and whose conspiracies elude us."

Some curiosity having been aroused as to this man Catilina the account given of him by Lempriere will be interesting:

"L. Sergius Catilina, a celebrated Roman, descended of a noble family. When he had squandered away his fortune by his debaucheries and extravagance, and been refused the consulship, he secretly meditated the ruin of his country, and conspired with many of the most illustrious of the Romans, as dissolute as himself, to extirpate the Senate, plunder the treasury, and set Rome on fire. This conspiracy was timely discovered by the Consul Cicero, whom he had resolved to murder; and Catilina, after he had declared his intentions in the full Senate, and attempted to vindicate himself, on seeing five of his accomplices arrested, retired to Gaul, where his partisans were assembling an army; while Cicero at Rome punished the condemned conspirators. Petrius, the other Consul's lieutenant, attacked Catilina's ill-disciplined troops and routed them. Catilina was killed in the engagement, bravely fighting about the middle of December B. C. 63. His character has been deservedly branded with the foulest infamy. . . . It has been reported that Catilina and the other conspirators drank human blood to make their oaths more firm and inviolable."

It will be seen that Mr. Bigelow is rather severe in the application of his classical references; but not more severe than the circumstances seem to justify.

WHAT IS THE MATTER WITH THE ARMY?

The latest report of Adjutant-General F. C. Ainsworth, of the United States Army, reveals the alarming fact that in the last fiscal year there were nearly five thousand desertions from the military service of this country. Counting desertions from the Philippine Scouts, the number is rolled up to five thousand and thirty men. In twelve years fifty thousand men have deserted. As to this state of affairs, General Ainsworth says that the large number of desertions "is simply a disgrace to the army and a reproach to American citizenship."

Mr. Bailey Millard, in a recent number of the Cosmopolitan, enters into a discussion of conditions in the service and suggests that the responsibility for so disgraceful a number of desertions must be chiefly laid at the door of the Government. He supports much that he said on a comparison with similar conditions in the British Army, the only large military organization which can be likened to ours, since both the armies of the United States and of Great Britain have the same basis of voluntary enlistment. The percentage of desertion in our army has been 4.97, while in the British Army the percentage has been but 1.7.

Declaring that the outlook is for an increasing number of desertions, Mr. Millard writes:

"It is in the dog-days that most men desert. Over twenty-three per cent. of last year's desertions occurred in July and August. A hot hike over a dusty road in a practice march, in which the valiant private sees no sense or reason; a ditch to be dug under the blazing summer sun; an acre of brush to be grubbed out, or a close, smelly stable to be cleaned out by the sweat of the cavalryman's brow, and there is an end to the dream of military glory. . . . It is a shock to most young Americans who have enlisted in the army to taste the delights of military life to find that the most important part of their training, from the viewpoint of the post commander, is to dig ditches, wash pots and pans, wait on table, clean out stables, sweep off walks, or cut brush in the hot sun. These were the conditions the deserters from the posts found in the army. Soon they began to loathe the life. It sickened their souls, it humbled their pride, and they ran away from the service."

There were but five companies in the army last year from which there were no desertions. There were few desertions from any of the colored companies. Mr. Millard says:

"In fact, as they say in the army, the darkey rarely deserts. While of the white troops 5.17 per cent. deserted last year, of the colored troops only .56 per cent. were reported as deserters. This is because the colored man finds the service quite to his taste. On an average he can do better in it than he can out of it. Hence he remains, eats Uncle Sam's rations, does Uncle Sam's chores, and is happy. The white soldier deserts because the army is a disappointment to him. The life is something other than he had pictured it. To do menial labor, to get down into a ditch on a hot day and wield a shovel, to take his turn at scrubbing pots and pans, is not what he joined the army for, and so he decamps."

Another reason advanced by this writer is that we are "not a military people." The tendency is too prevalent among us to regard desertion lightly; to think of it as nothing more serious than a breach of contract for employment in order to accept a better job somewhere else. Public sentiment is not in the direction of ostracizing of the deserter.

In the last two years the War Department has been carrying on a severe campaign for the arrest of deserters. The Bertillon system of measuring and photographing is now used upon each new recruit. The method is just like that used for rogues' galleries. The reward for the apprehension of a deserter has been increased from ten to fifty dollars.

"In time of war a deserter is shot. In time of peace, under present conditions, it is the belief among many humanitarians that he might as well be. When a man deserts from our army in these peaceful times, he loses all his rights of citizenship, his pay and his clothes; is dismissed with dishonor from the service, and if captured is condemned to hard labor and prison fare. If in the meantime, he should try to return to the army by going to another post, he is not only sentenced for desertion, but also for fraudulent enlistment."

In England, almost the reverse system is used in handling deserters. The percentage of desertion there is less than one-third of that in this country. There a deserter is merely detained in barracks for a period of seven to twenty-eight days. There is no Bertillon system; they do not measure a soldier as if he were doomed to criminality. In 1908 there were 4,756 desertions in the English Army, but 1,728 men reenlisted. Mr. Millard says:

"The military prison at Fort Leavenworth is Uncle Sam's great crime hatchery. Of late a new and stronger prison is being built to accommodate more young men who have found that in the army 'jumping a job' is not like lightly leaping from an office or a shop. The young man who is liberated from the military prison at the end of his term of sentence goes forth a released convict, with a convict's shame and disgrace, a convict's view of society, and a convict's keen desire for revenge upon it."

One fact there is that stands out in favor of the American soldiery. During the Spanish War less than one per cent. were reported as deserters. In the Boer War 2.5 per cent. of the whole British Army deserted. American soldiers do not desert in time of war, be it said to their credit.

While it is probable that a less rigid set of regulations as to desertion would help the situation, the remedy for the condition seems hard to find. It has been suggested that the providing of amusements for the soldiers in the way of shows and concerts might be a good thing, but we do not see how the doing of menial tasks is to be avoided. There is much work of that sort to be done, and this country has no money to squander on a special and independent class of servants, who shall relieve the soldiers of their rough work. The United States cannot afford to maintain a vast number of gentlemen who do nothing but dress and drill. The life of "ease with dignity" never has been and, we hope, never will be the soldier's life. Conditions are improving and are making for the greater comfort of the soldier. The conditions in our army regarding desertion ought to be studied with a view to effective remedy; but the War Deparmtent will hardly make the enlisted man's life a sinecure.

DR. COOK GONE AFTER THE POLE AGAIN.

A letter from Godhavn, Greenland, received at Copenhagen, reports that "it is certain that Dr. Frederick A. Cook is on his way to find the records which he claims to have left in the north. Recently an American steamer stopped in Godhavn harbor for an hour, apparently confirming the reports in the American papers about Dr. Cook's having started for the Arctic regions to recover his instruments and papers. The letter says everybody in Greenland still believes that Dr. Cook reached the North Pole and that some day he will return with the proofs."

We do not know when Dr. Cook got away from Houston, Texas, where he had been living incognito, nor when; but it appears that he has really gone after his records, and, faith, he'll find them, exactly where he left them, right forninst the Pole; that is to say, unless the drift has changed their position and unless Commander Peary or Matt Henson (by the way, does anybody know what has become of Matt?) pre-empted them when they say they got there. It is certain that we have not heard the last of Dr. Cook, and that "Truth crushed to earth (the same being Dr. Cook in this case) will rise again, and Error (the New York Times and Captain Loose and all the rest of the pack that have assailed the Original Discoverer of the North Pole) will die amid" their fellow-conspirators. Did Dr. Cook reach the Pole? Why, of course, he did. He has told all about it, a perfectly straight story, and Ap-pe-lah and I-tuk-a-shoo, or whatever their names, were with him when he won his triumph, the greatest triumph ever won by human being. Never fear, that all Dr. Cook's honors will come back to him, heaped up and running over.

THE UNDUE INFLUENCE OF OFFICEHOLDERS.

The Charlottesville Progress, in the course of an article on the "expensive indifference" of the people who take no interest in the public acts of their representatives, says:

The point we desire to make, however, is that because the officeholders are usually very active in politics, and, by reason of their offices, wield more than the average citizen's influence in choosing legislators, affords no justification on the part of the Legislature for losing sight of the interests of the tax-payers, or of attaching undue importance to the demands of officeholders.

Whether true or not, there is a widespread feeling in Virginia that offices and officeholders are the first consideration of the General Assembly, and that the great body of tax-payers, who employ no lobby, but depend upon their representatives for protection are being saddled, from year to year, with additional and unnecessary expenses of State and county government.

There is much more than a grain of truth in what our contemporary says. There can be no question that, acting individually and informally, the officeholders exert a powerful influence in matters which affect them. They do not come to the Capitol in a body; perhaps few of them come at all; but "back home" they have their say with the local legislative representatives. There is no other possible hypothesis upon which the originating and passing of the four proposed amendments to the Virginia Constitution by the General Assembly can be explained. There was some demand for these changes: we are sure it was not a demand from the people; and who else but the officeholders desire these amendments? Was it not natural that, having given the officeholders a liberal batch of legislation, the legislators should endeavor to grant to themselves a ninety days session of the General Assembly? What will the people get out of it?

The moral is: Let the people wake up to their own interests. The rest will be simple.

LIQUOR IN NEW HAMPSHIRE.

In 1904 there were 144 prohibition towns in New Hampshire, and in 1908, 183 prohibition towns. There has been a growing sentiment against liquor selling, and a very active movement is now in progress for the repeal of the license law. The New Hampshire Retail and Wholesale Liquor Dealers' Association has written a letter to the Manchester Union denying that it has taken any part in the nomination of candidates or in trying to influence the election of candidates who can be called liquor dealer candidates. The Association contends that it is as sincere as any so-called prohibition organization for the reduction of the evil of intemperance, and calls attention to the fact that 95 per cent. of the papers of the State openly oppose any return to the conditions which existed under prohibition. The reason for this, as we understand it, is that prohibition did not prohibit; it has not actually prohibited anywhere, and regulation is better than prohibition.

BONDS FOR BUILDING ROADS.

Why should intelligent men oppose a bond issue for good roads? Yet many such men do. Often we hear them decrying bond issues, because bond issues in former times have been wasted through mismanagement. Such men fear to trust money any more to county boards or officers. That is good enough as many objections go, but when it is remembered that the people can elect boards that they can trust, the matter assumes a different aspect, and there is really no reason why they should not elect such boards. As the Birmingham Ledger wisely puts it:

"It is not wisdom to hold back a great public movement because certain officials are incompetent, or worse. We have already come to the time when the public finds it necessary to be careful about the men elected to spend the public money. Beyond question, a large part of the public money is wasted, but some counties have no trouble. Talladega County under good officials not only has a balance in its treasury credited to the proper funds, but it is building and maintaining its roads without any issue at all. All counties could do that. The incomes are all ample, but the expense account is the trouble."

In looking at the cost of better roadways, we must remember that the roads are for all time, and that the bonds can be passed on down to posterity, each generation paying the interest. The cost may seem out of proportion, but the net gain for all time outweighs such an objection as that.

"The whole nation seems to be plunging hellward" is what the Hon. Thomas E. Watson told the people of Atlanta in his speech at the Auditorium in that city Friday night. Mr. Watson ought to change his point of view, move away from the centre of disturbance, and come to Richmond where we live in Heaven every day.

While he is away up North, how would it do for the Colonel to run over to Montreal and tell the Catholic Congress how he issued his grand deli to the Pope of Rome? The Colonel has not touched on this subject at all since he got back home. He could tell a thrilling story about how he made Merry del Val shake in his apostolic shoes, even if he could not excuse his own very bad manners.

What sort of a pistol does the Colonel tote? Is it automatic, like his mouth? Where has the Colonel buried all the bad men he has killed? Does the Sun happen to know what disposition was made of the Spaniard he shot down in Cuba?

Suppose when the battleship Maine is raised it should appear that the ship was wrecked by an internal explosion, what sort of apology would be proper to Spain?

Down in South Carolina the people do not want Featherstone and they won't take Blease; so it begins to look like Featherstone.

A scarcity of chorus girls is reported in New York. How would it do for the Houston Post to supply the deficit with the red-headed widows of its town?

A miserable correspondent of the New York Sun, probably a member of the Old Guard, complains to that paper that the managers of the Colonel's reception at Kansas City made "a serious mistake;" that "Theodore Roosevelt left the asylum, made a speech and then failed to go back."

Daily Queries and Answers

Address all communications for this column to Query Editor, Times-Dispatch. No mathematical problems will be solved, no coins or stamps valued and no dealers' names will be given.

Thebes and Nineveh.

Please tell me if there is a city called Thebes, and where Nineveh is located.

Thebes was a city of ancient Egypt, situated on both sides of the Nile. The village of Luxor now stands on the site. The remains of antiquity here are of great interest. Another Thebes, in ancient times, was the chief city of Boetia, Greece, and the site is now marked by the modern Thiva.

Nineveh was, for a long time, the capital of the Assyrian empire, situated on the east bank of the upper Tigris, opposite the modern Mosul. The site, now marked by two mounds of Kiyunjik and Nebiyunns, was first identified in 1820 by J. C. Rich, political resident of the East India Company at Bagdad.

Pronunciation of Juanita.

Kindly let a reader know how to pronounce the name of the song "Juanita." I would like to prove myself right in an argument.

Juanita is pronounced "Wah (the a like a in fall) netah" (the a like in fat).

Most Valuable Diamonds.

I was always of the opinion that pure white diamonds are the finest quality of diamonds, but recently heard that a blue-white and blue diamonds are worth 10 per cent. and 20 per cent. more, respectively, than pure white diamonds. Please advise me if this is true. C. F.

Blue-white and blue diamonds are both more costly than white diamonds; the increase in price varies according to the depth of color.

Two New States.

Have Arizona and New Mexico been admitted as States?

As soon as New Mexico and Arizona shall have complied with the requirements for admission as States contained in the bill that has been passed by Congress and has been signed by President Taft, the United States will be without a territorial form of government within the vast area bounded by Canada on the north, Mexico and the Gulf of Mexico on the south and the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans on the east and west, respectively, except the District of Columbia. Outside the nation proper there will remain under territorial government Alaska, with nearly 600,000 square miles, and Hawaii, with 6,740 square miles.

Waldo, Portrait Painter.

Please give me what information you can regarding an American portrait painter named Waldo, who lived in the early part of the last century. A. M.

The portrait painter, Samuel Waldo (1783-1861) was a native of Connecticut. He received his first instructions in art in his native State, but painted for some time in Charleston, S. C. In 1806 he proceeded to London and was admitted into the small, but select circle of American artists than in the English metropolis. After painting portraits in London for three years, he returned to the United States in 1809, and opened a studio in New York, where the remainder of his professional life was spent. He devoted himself to portrait painting with marked success. The New York Historical Society owns his likeness of Peter Remsen, and several portraits of ex-Mayors of the city of New York, by Waldo, are in the City Hall there.

Initiative and Referendum.

Kindly give the full meaning and explanation of initiative and referendum advocated by Bryan so much. H. E. L.

The referendum is the political institution by which laws are submitted to a vote of the people after they have been sanctioned by the Legislature, but before they become laws.

The initiative is the political institution by which the people propose a law, vote on it, and, in some cases, pass it. By this method the people act in their sovereign capacity as opposed to their representative capacity.

MANY TRAGEDIES IN ANNALS OF FAMILY

BY LA MARQUISE DE FONTENOY.

LADY MARGERY ERSKINE'S tragic death, on a remote Highland hillside, where she had apparently succumbed to starvation, thirst and exposure, after breaking her ankle, at least a month having elapsed between her demise and the discovery of the almost totally unrecognizable remains of this particularly beautiful woman, may be said to have been in keeping, after all, with the tragedies and dramas which fill the pages of the annals of her historic but eccentric house. Daughter of the fourteenth and diminutive Earl of Buchan, famous as possessing the smallest head of the peerage, and long known as the "pocket Adonis," she was descended, like him, from the Black Knight of Lorn, and Joan, Queen Dowager of Scotland, their second son, having been created first Earl of Buchan in 1469. Buchan was one of the old Mermaerships or earldoms of Scotland, which was for a couple of hundred years in the possession of the Comyn family, which forfeited it by siding against Bruce. It was afterwards conferred upon Alexander Stewart, known as "the Wolf of Badenoch," son of King Robert II., and then upon John Stewart, Constable of France, going from him to his nephew, James Stewart, who, as mentioned above, was a son of Joan, Queen Dowager of Scotland. It was he who was the first of the present line of earls.

Many of them have been extremely odd. Thus, the eleventh earl, when appointed by Pitt (afterwards Lord Chatham) to the post of secretary of the British embassy in Spain, calmly declined to go to Madrid, because the ambassador, Sir James Grey, was a person of inferior social rank. According to Horace Walpole, the father of Sir James was a footman of James II. It was this same eleventh earl who, on one occasion, prided himself on having practically made the fortunes of his brothers, which excited surprise, since he was known to be extraordinarily close-fisted, especially with regard to his relatives. Continuing, he remarked: "Yes, it is true. They owe everything to me. On my father's death they pressed me for a small annual allowance. I knew that this would have been their ruin, by relaxing their industry. So, making a sacrifice of my inclination, to gratify them, I refused to give them a farthing, and they have thriven ever since, owing everything to me."

The late and thirteenth Earl of Buchan was a most cranky and eccentric individual. According to his own account, given under oath on the occasion of one of the many bankruptcy proceedings against him, he earned his daily bread in his younger days, when there were still six lives between himself and the earldom, as a jockey, his father, the twelfth earl, being unwilling to make him any allowance. His riding was not always above reproach, and on one occasion, at Redcliffe, the public, suspecting him of not having done his best, gave him chase when he returned to the paddock, and he had to take refuge in a cottage in the vicinity; but the mob got some straw and set fire to it, and it was only with the utmost difficulty that he was rescued. He married in 1849 a woman of some wealth, a Miss Graham, but after bearing him two sons, he behaved so abominably towards her that she was compelled to leave him, securing, not a divorce, but a judicial separation. He was considerably over forty when he succeeded to the earldom and estates; and, owing to the fact that the family property was heavily encumbered, and that he was himself overwhelmed with debts, to the tune of some $250,000, he, before many years were past, found himself in a worse mess than before. Finally, when unable to get any money or credit any longer, he made an arrangement with his eldest son, who had inherited a considerable amount of money from his mother, and who had also made a rich marriage, whereby the son, then known as Lord Cardross, assumed the ownership of the family estates, paying off his father's liabilities and settling upon him a liberal annuity for the remainder of his days.

Subsequently minerals and also oil were discovered on the estates, which largely increased their value; whereupon the old earl regretted his bargain, and tried to get the property back. Failing in this, he purposely embarked in all kinds of extravagances, largely exceeding his annuity. He not only went to the length of indorsing other people's notes, with little or no advantage to himself, but actually, in spite of his age, got himself heavily mulcted in damages as corespondent in a divorce suit, and then borrowed money at extravagant interest from the notorious money-lender Jay, in London, in order to meet this particular liability. Small wonder that his eldest son, who had never forgotten the shameful manner in which his mother had been treated by the earl, declined to do anything more for the old gentleman, and permitted him to be made a bankrupt, rather than pay his debts afresh.

It was in consequence of this that the old earl wrote a letter, of which I have a copy before me, in which he declared that his marriage in 1849 to his first wife was illegal, and his eldest son illegitimate, and that in consequence thereof he had transferred from his older to his younger son Albany the right of making use of his minor title of Lord Cardross—a transfer of which the crown, the authorities and society took no notice whatsoever. The second son, however, who was a chip of the old block, and a familiar figure in the courts of bankruptcy and divorce, sided with his father, and styled himself Lord Cardross, exciting much ridicule thereby. The late Lord Buchan even went to the length of forwarding an official communication to the Committee of Privileges of the House of Lords, insisting that his eldest son was illegitimate, and protesting against his eventual succession to the earldom. The Committee of Privileges, as bound to do under the circumstances, duly investigated all the circumstances of the case, found the charges to be without any basis, and after the old man's death recommended the sovereign to vest the succession in the eldest son—that is to say, the present and fourteenth Lord Buchan.

The latter enjoys the questionable distinction of being the only British peer whose birthday falls on February 29. His last birthday was celebrated in 1908, and his next one will be two years hence. On one occasion he was actually obliged to go eight years without a birthday. That was during the period that elapsed between 1896 and 1904—1900 being, of course, not a leap year.

Not even since his recognition by the Committee of Privileges of the House of Lords and by the crown has the present Lord Buchan been allowed to enjoy his estates and his honors in peace. A year or so after his father's death a London lawyer of the name of Milton Bradford turned up (but whose real patronymic developed during the course of some divorce proceedings to be Corey) with a story to the effect that in 1842—that is to say, seven years before the marriage of the present Lord Buchan's mother to the thirteenth earl—the latter had gone through a form of common law marriage with another woman in Scotland. The son born of this marriage was the claimant, and, according to his account, his mother deserted the late earl after living with him about three years, and eventually ended her days in a lunatic asylum, a year subsequent to the birth of the present earl—a fact which, if true, would have been sufficient, of course, to invalidate his legitimacy. The claimant declared that he had encountered the thirteenth earl shortly before his death, and that the latter had then recognized him as his eldest son, and placed him in possession of a number of papers establishing the fact. The claimant, although he styles himself Earl of Buchan, has never got beyond a protest to the Committee of Privileges of the House of Lords against the succession of the recognized fourteenth Earl of Buchan; for the legal procedure of the establishment of a claim to a peerage before the Committee of Privileges of the House of Lords is one of the most costly processes in British litigation—in fact, it requires almost a fortune, and this the claimant does not seem to possess. Lord Buchan has two other daughters, who, like their ill-fated sister, Lady Margery, have inherited much of the great beauty of Lady Buchan, who is one of the Sartoris family—that is to say, half-Irish, half-Spanish. The eldest, Lady Muriel, is married to a younger son of Lord Ancaster, while the other, Lady Evelyn, is married to Lord Iveagh's younger son, the Hon. Walter Guinness. They have one brother, who bears the courtesy title of Lord Cardross, and who has resigned his commission in the Scots Guards in order to settle in British East Africa, where he farms on a very extensive scale, where he entertained Colonel Roosevelt, and where he finds a life more healthy, active and unconventional than he could ever hope to have as a guardsman in Mayfair.

(Copyright, 1910, by the Brentwood Company.)